REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 22 and 23 are amended, and claim 24 is added, leaving claims 1-24 pending with claim 1 being independent. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 22 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Examiner states that each of these claims is grammatically incorrect. As noted above, each of these claims has been amended to overcome this rejection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komori et al (CN 1453481) in view of Asai et al. (US 6,412,984).

Applicants submit that the claims as now pending are allowable over the cited prior art. Specifically, amended independent claim 1 recites a fluid bearing device wherein the housing has an adhesion portion and is formed of resin, the second member is formed of metal, and adhesion is disposed between the adhesion portion of the housing and the second member, and wherein the adhesion portion of the housing has a molded and roughed surface having a surface roughness of 0.5 µmRa or more.

The cited prior art fails to disclose or render obvious such a device. In particular, the Examiner states that Komori discloses an adhesion portion of at least one of a second member and a housing having a roughened surface having a surface roughness of 0.5 µmRa or more. However, claim 1 now recites, that the housing has a molded and roughed surface having a surface roughness of 0.5 µmRa or more. Komori, at best, discloses that the chamfered portion 8f at the inner periphery of the bearing sleeve has a surface roughness of Ra 0.5 or more. *See* col. 14, lines 9-18 of US 7,025,505 (Komori).

Moreover, Komori simply fails to disclose that adhesion is disposed between the adhesion portion of the housing and the second member. In fact, Komori is silent with regard to

6

how the "housing" 7c is fixed to the bearing sleeve 8. Additionally, Applicants submit that Asai fails to overcome the deficiencies of Komori.

Moreover, there is no reasoning in the prior art to modify Asai or Komori such that the combination thereof would have rendered independent claim 1 obvious. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicants also submit that the dependent claims recite additional subject matter that further distinguishes them over the cited prior art. For example, new dependent claim 24 recites an adhesion gap between the adhesion portion of the housing and the second member, and the adhesion fills in the adhesion gap. The cited prior art fails to disclose or render obvious such a claim element.

Claims 3-5, 8-10 and 12-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komori in view of Asai, as applied to claim 1.

Applicants submit that since each of these claims is dependent from claim 1, each of these claims is allowable over the cited prior art for the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the claims now pending in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe there are any remaining issues that must be resolved before this application can be allowed, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenji ITO

By

/Jeffrey J. Howell/
2011.04.08 14:59:26 -04'00'

Jeffrey J. Howell
Registration No. 46,402
Attorney for Applicant

JJH/etc
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 8, 2011